Volume 11

Pages 1941 - 2026

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William H. Alsup, Judge

SONOS, INC., Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,

VS.

NO. C 20-6754 WHA)Related Case No. C 21-07559 WHA

GOOGLE, LLC, Defendant and

Counter-Claimant.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, May 24, 2023

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant:

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP The Orrick Building

405 Howard Street

San Francisco, California 94105

BY: ELIZABETH R. MOULTON, ATTORNEY AT LAW

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3200 Los Angeles, California 90017

BY: ALYSSA M. CARIDIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR

Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)

For Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant:

LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP 656 West Randolph Street

Floor 5W

Chicago, Illinois 60661

BY: COLE B. RICHTER, ATTORNEY AT LAW RORY PATRICK SHEA, ATTORNEY AT LAW

For Defendant/Counter-Claimant:

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 50 California Street, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111

BY: SEAN PAK, ATTORNEY AT LAW MELISSA J. BAILY, ATTORNEY AT LAW LINDSAY COOPER, ATTORNEY AT LAW IMAN LORDGOOEI, ATTORNEY AT LAW

Wednesday, May 24, 2023

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

---000---

(The following proceedings were held outside of the presence of the Jury)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling Civil Action 20-6754, Sonos Inc. versus Google, LLC, and related cases. Counsel, please approach the podium and state your appearances for the record, beginning with counsel for plaintiff.

MR. RICHTER: Good morning, Your Honor. Good to be with you. Cole Richter on behalf of Sonos. With me today is my partner, Rory Shea. Also with me is Alyssa Caridis and Elizabeth Moulton, all on behalf of Sonos.

THE COURT: Thank you. Welcome to you.

MR. PAK: Good morning, Your Honor. Sean Pak on behalf of Google. With me is Melissa Baily, Lindsay Cooper and Iman Lordgooei. Thank Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Each of you made a Rule 50 The jury is not here today, but is in deliberations, motion. and will resume its deliberations on Friday. But I thought since you each filed a brief and an opposition, we will get a start, at least, and maybe -- maybe this will be our only hearing on Rule 50.

So I want to give each of you a chance to make -- and maybe even more, if time permits -- make one major point that

```
you want to make sure is impressed on me.
                                                Then I'll give the
 1
     other side a chance to respond to your major point. And then
 2
     we will flip it around, and the other side gets to make a major
 3
     point.
 4
 5
          So we'll see.
                         That will probably take about an hour, just
     that much.
 6
                 Who wants to go first? Since the defendant usually
 7
          Okay.
     gets to go first on Rule 50, Google, you get to go first.
 8
                       Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. PAK:
 9
              THE COURT: But you only get to make one point.
10
11
     Because a lot of it's in the briefs. I don't want to -- I want
     you to make a point that you feel like I might otherwise --
12
     where oral argument is an additional benefit.
13
          Go ahead.
14
              MR. PAK:
                        Thank Your Honor.
15
16
          So if we could have the slides up.
17
          (Document displayed)
              MR. PAK: Turning to slide 3, Your Honor -- and I'll
18
     be happy to hand these up after the conclusion.
19
          Your Honor, the first point I want to make is that the
20
     claims in this case -- all the claims -- do not require any
21
     type of user action in terms of creation, configuration, saving
22
23
     and recollection of any of the zone scenes.
          And I wanted to present to you some of the testimony that
24
```

we heard from Dr. Almeroth, the Sonos expert, on this issue.

```
Quoting from Transcript 1659, Line 21 to 1660, Line 5.
 1
     of his examination with Sonos's counsel, as you can see, he was
 2
     trying to distinguish the Party Mode option as not being a zone
 3
     scene. And he repeatedly refers to "user action" throughout
 4
 5
     his testimony. Not customizable by the user, the user cannot
     add or customize.
 6
          If we turn to the next slide, Transcript 1661, Line 12 to
 7
     20.
 8
          (Document displayed)
 9
              MR. PAK: Did not provide a user with any ability to
10
11
     customize, and so on.
          So we've heard this throughout the case. And I think it
12
     is very clear, Your Honor, that this is not a basis to
13
     distinguish the Party Mode that existed. And, to just make
14
15
     clear what the evidence showed at trial, Party Mode was
16
     persistent. It was always saved in the system in the form of
17
    both the executable code that resides in the flash memory of
18
     the devices, the zone players of the Sonos 2005 system.
          After you initiate the startup of all the zone players in
19
     the house, they will communicate with each other. They will
20
21
     collect what's called "group topology" which is all of the
22
     members that are present in the room. That membership
     information is saved.
23
```

And we had testimony from Mr. Millington --

THE COURT:

You's are referring to the Sonos prior art

24

PROCEEDINGS

system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's right, Your Honor. So the Sonos 2005 MR. PAK: system, which had the built-in Party Mode. The Party Mode would be saved at that time when all of the group topology information was collected, and stored -- I think we heard something called xml file format, where that information resides in temporary memory. That is present before a user takes any action. So you have the creation and the saving of that information by the system, automatically.

Then at some point the user can go to the user interface of the controller. And they will always see the Party Mode as an option that's built in. When the user pushes Party Mode, it invokes that Party Mode group. We heard testimony from both Mr. Millington as well as Dr. Schonfeld that at that point, there's a further recreation of that Party -- all -- all zones Party Mode feature. In that all the members of that speaker group will then receive the AVTransport URI message, except for the group coordinator, which is one of the zone players in the That causes all the other ones to communicate with that group coordinator zone player.

Some point, all that information is saved. And then, there is a further storage that occurs.

THE COURT: Wait, wait. All of it is saved to identify the -- what? The Party Mode participants?

> That's right, Your Honor. So what happens MR. PAK:

is then at that point, all of that information is further stored in terms of the operation of the devices, where the group coordinator now knows through the set AVTransport messages being communicated and the internal messages that are happening between the zone players. There will be a storage of that information in a persistent manner.

We heard evidence in this case that the Party Mode information as well as the group topology information is saved, is stored.

THE COURT: Where was it stored?

MR. PAK: It's stored in the zone players, Your Honor. So in the group coordinator device, it's stored in a persistent manner.

And one of the reasons why we heard for that is you could have multiple controllers in the same house. So using one controller, you can set up the Party Mode. Another controller can enter the house. It doesn't have any a priori knowledge of what the group topology is, or what the different party mode settings are. It will then be able to grab that information and be able to know which zone players are in the system and which Party Mode members exist.

That's all in evidence. So there's further causation of storage of that information, in a persistent manner.

Persistence, Your Honor, both experts agree that this is with respect to the '966 element of causing storage. That it

has to be persistent, in that between the time you create and 1 save the zone scene, there is a period of time before you 2 invoke it. 3 But the critical point is, the claims say nothing about 4 how long you have to wait. There's no time restriction. 5 in fact, we saw in the patent, itself, that it specifically 6 7 teaches that any saved zone scene can be invoked at any time. And we have some very important testimony that came in, 8 Your Honor. And I want to turn to --9 THE COURT: Before you -- I want to hear what you're 10 11 about to say. But, at a higher level, where is this headed? So let's say that we decide Party Mode is a zone scene. 12 13 But that's only one. Where's the -- you need an overlapping 14 zone scene. That's right, Your Honor. 15 MR. PAK: 16 THE COURT: Where are you headed, as to what the other 17 one is? MR. PAK: So the other one -- if you remember in the 18 Sonos 2005 prior art system, you also have what are called 19 "dynamic groups." So those dynamic groups can be created on 20 top of Party Mode. The dynamic group can be given names so the 21 user could go in and create whatever name they wanted to give 22 23 it.

Those dynamic groups necessarily overlapped with the Party

Mode because Party Mode included everything. These dynamic

24

PROCEEDINGS

groups could be set to only include a subset. But no matter how you set up the dynamic groups, there was always overlap with the Party Mode, which included every zone player in the house.

Where we're heading, Your Honor, is this. The only thing the Sonos 2005 system could not do was save those dynamic groups for later use. And so this is where we get all of the obviousness opinions that we heard about. Much of it was --

THE COURT: Wait. You said something about 30 seconds ago that I don't remember in the testimony. You said that a dynamic group could be named and -- could be named. I don't remember that. I thought -- I thought it would be that you could -- you could add dining room to the garage, or -- but you -- it didn't -- I don't remember there being a way to name that. And really, naming implies that it is saved. But there was -- but I thought the testimony was it was not saved.

MR. PAK: So the names I'm referring to, Your Honor, are the speaker names. So one of the things that the system allows you to do with dynamic groups is, if I add a zone player to the system, I can name that zone player "Dining Room," "Living Room," "Party Speaker 1," whatever name you wanted to give it. The system would, when you create the dynamic group, append each of those named speaker names, and create a different name.

So we think that qualifies as a common theme, regardless

```
of the fact that it was the individual zone players that were
 1
    named. But when you concatenate, you basically have a theme
 2
     that would be a common theme, or into the group.
 3
          But the --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: But that wouldn't show up on the little
     handheld -- what's it called?
 6
              MR. PAK: Controller.
 7
              THE COURT: Controller. The name wouldn't show up on
 8
     the controller, would it?
 9
              MR. PAK: It would. The additions, if I named it
10
     "Living Room" and "Party Speaker," the controller would show
11
     that the group that I'm forming would be the living room
12
13
     speaker with the Party Mode -- or party speaker. So that would
    be --
14
              THE COURT: There would be a line item on the
15
16
     controller that says "Living Room" plus --
17
              MR. PAK: Correct.
              THE COURT: Would that literally say "plus"?
18
              MR. PAK: I believe that's right. We can go back and
19
20
     look at the controller. But --
21
              THE COURT: I don't remember that.
              MR. PAK: Yeah.
22
              THE COURT: But maybe that's true; I just don't
23
     remember it. Okay, continue with where you are headed.
24
25
              MR. PAK: Yes. So where we are headed is regardless
```

And it specifically says that summer and winter modes will be

overlapping, in that the summer mode would include the deck

24

1952 speakers, while the winter mode would not. 1 So we're illustrating that scenario on the image to the 2 left where, for example, winter, if the zone player on the 3 left-hand side, 106, was a deck speaker, it would be included 4 5 in the summer mode. But it would not be included in the winter 6 mode. So you would have two party modes, according to this Sonos 7 prior art posting, where you have two distinct zone scenes that 8 would be saved that would have a thematic name, summer and 9 winter, and they would overlap. 10 11 And whenever Your Honor's ready I could turn to --THE COURT: Up at the top it says "Macro/presets." 12 that something that was in the original? Or is that something 13 that you added to it? 14 This is in the original document, 15 MR. PAK: No. 16 Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: "Macro/presets"? MR. PAK: Yes, Your Honor. So this is part of -- the 18 entire thread starts with "Macro/presets." That's the topic. 19 And I'll show you some more forum posts that talk about macros 20 specifically. But that was in the original document, part of 21 22 the prior art posting by the Sonos users.

23 And if you turn to the next slide.

(Document displayed)

24

25

MR. PAK: I was asking Mr. Lambourne on

cross-examination about that very document, which is TX3930. 1 And I asked him (As read): 2 "QUESTION: What Jeff T, the user, was 3 describing in a publicly available Sonos 4 5 forum posting dated September 22, 2005, is having multiple zone scenes that are saved 6 for later; correct? 7 "ANSWER: Yes. 8 "QUESTION: And those scenes (sic) could be 9 overlapping in that they would share a 10 11 speaker or a zone player, correct? "ANSWER: Yes, and in the summer and winter 12 13 mode he is describing, yes." So we have clear testimony from the man who knows his 14 15 invention best that what he was seeing in these Sonos prior 16 forum postings is multiple overlapping zone scenes that are 17 saved for a later invocation. 18 If you turn to the next slide. 19 (Document displayed) 20 MR. PAK: We brought many more posts. 21 "theboyg" forum posting that we've discussed with Your Honor and presented to the jury. This one is entitled "Virtual Zones 22 23 and Zone Grouping." In that, you see the virtual zone -- which is his name for 24 25 the concept of zone scenes -- called "Downstairs." And he

1 says: "I can group all my downstairs zones into 2 this. Then I don't have to keep manually 3 linking/unlinking multiple zones everytime." 4 5 That is precisely the problem that Mr. Lambourne identified for his inventions. 6 7 And if you go to the next slide. (Document displayed) 42 8 I asked Mr. Lambourne about this post. 9 MR. PAK: And I asked him -- this is transcript 549, Line 24, to 550 at 10 10 (As read): 11 "QUESTION: And theuserboyG says, 'Why can't 12 I have a virtual zone, a zone called 13 downstairs and I can group all my downstairs 14 15 zones into this? Then I don't have to keep 16 manually linking/unlinking multiple zones every time. 17 Please.' 18 "ANSWER: Yes. "QUESTION: So, again, this virtual zone 19 20 where you have a downstairs zone that is 21 saved for future use so you don't have to manually link it and unlink it, that was 22 23 describing your idea for zone scenes; 24 correct? 25 "ANSWER: But, I mean, without much Yes.

detail. But, yes, that -- broadly speaking." 1 2 So he acknowledges again, Mr. Lambourne, that the concept of having multiple zone scenes that save for later was 3 4 disclosed in the prior art. 5 And if you turn to the next slide. (Document displayed) 6 MR. PAK: This is where the solution piece comes in. 7 It's not just that he was seeing the idea of zone scenes, 8 Mr. Lambourne, in these forum postings, he was also seeing the 9 same solution. This is critical to all the issues that the 10 11 other side has raised in their briefing. This is transcript, at Page 528, Line 11, to 529, Line 7. 12 If you recall, Mr. Lambourne walked through his conception 13 story with the various notebook entries, and his conception 14 15 document, which is dated December 21, 2005. 16 I asked him, based on that testimony (As read): "QUESTION: One of the solutions that you 17 were thinking of for your eventual zone scene 18 invention was the use of macros to implement 19 20 zone scenes? 21 "ANSWER: Yes." And this is critical. 22 I use the words somewhat 23 "ANSWER: interchangeably. You know, my focus was on 24 creating user-facing functionality. So I 25

```
describe them loosely as zone groups, macros,
 1
               zone scenes and other things.
 2
               "QUESTION: They were interchangeable to you
 3
               from a UI designer's perspective; correct?
 4
 5
               "ANSWER:
                         Yes."
          And if we turn to the next slide, transcript Page 531,
 6
     Line 15 through 22, I asked him:
 7
               "QUESTION: ...macros can be thought of as
 8
               programming instructions..."
 9
          Which are the limitation language of the claims.
10
11
               "ANSWER: Big picture, yes.
               "QUESTION: And big picture, you could, in
12
13
               your mind, as a UI designer or user interface
               designer, you could use macros to implement
14
15
               zone screens; correct?
16
               "ANSWER: From a user perspective is the way
17
               I was describing macros in the notepad, yes.
18
               That was one word I had for it."
          And this is where the important examination questions come
19
20
     in.
          Next slide.
21
          (Document displayed)
                        Transcript at Page 538, Line 4, to 539,
22
              MR. PAK:
23
     Line 4:
               "QUESTION: So people were suggesting" --
24
               these people are the forum posts -- "were
25
```

1	suggesting ideas how to use macros and
2	presets to improve upon the Sonos 2005 prior
3	art system from their perspective; correct?
4	"ANSWER: Yes.
5	"QUESTION: So if I was in summer, I could
6	set up my summer Party Mode and then I could
7	set up a winter Party Mode that could be
8	saved for later use; correct?
9	"ANSWER: Yes.
10	"QUESTION: Again, that's consistent with the
11	examples that you gave in your patents of
12	zone scenes; correct?
13	"ANSWER: There can be more than one setup,
14	yes."
15	And then if you turn to the next slide, at TX3930.
16	(Document displayed)
17	MR. PAK: This is another prior art posting
18	Your Honor, Ken Greenwood, dated September 22, 2005:
19	"I would find this functionality useful as
20	well"
21	He was responding to the earlier post that we just saw
22	from boyG:
23	"I find myself manually linking and unlinking
24	setting volumes in a very repetitive way. I
25	would think that a macro type function would

1 be able to save those manual steps into a single selection of a favorite." 2 And if we turn to the next slide. 3 (Document displayed) 4 5 MR. PAK: This is the key testimony that I obtained on 6 cross-examination that I presented to the jury in closing. 7 Transcript Page 541, Line 2 through 7: "QUESTION: So Mr. Greenwood, in this prior 8 public posting about the Sonos 2005 system, 9 was describing the same type of problem that 10 11 you were trying to solve with zone scenes and suggesting macros, which is a similar 12 13 solution to what you had in mind for that functionality; correct? 14 15 "ANSWER: In broad terms, yes. As an 16 outcome, yes." 17 And if you turn to the next slide. 18 (Document displayed) TX3928. Here's another piece of prior art 19 MR. PAK: 20 forum posting that was presented during trial. September 22, This time from Mr. Majik, also known as Keith (As read): 21 2005. "Perhaps we need a 'pre-set' (sic) page (perhaps 22 using the soft-keys on the Zone screen) " -- that 23 would be on the controller -- "to allow a pre-set to 24 25 be initiated. This pre-set could comprise a zone (or

```
zone group)..."
 1
 2
               And it goes on to say:
               "...or it could be a macro sequence."
 3
          "Macro sequence."
 4
 5
          And why this is so important -- and if you turn to the
     next slide, 548.
 6
          (Document displayed)
 7
              MR. PAK: And he confirms this, Mr. Lambourne
 8
 9
     (As read):
               "QUESTION: And in the third paragraph he
10
11
               says 'Perhaps we read in a presets page.
               Perhaps using the soft keys on the zone
12
13
               screen to allow pre-set to be initiated.'
               you see that?
14
15
               "ANSWER: Yes.
16
               "QUESTION: And we saw documents and your
17
               testimony referring to zone scenes also as
18
               presets; correct?
               "ANSWER: Yes.
19
20
               "QUESTION: So Keith, user name Majik, was
21
               suggesting various ways that a pre-set for
22
               zone scenes could be implemented; correct?
23
               "ANSWER: Yes, on a broad level, yes."
          And just one more piece of evidence that came in. And
24
     most of this, Your Honor, in terms of substance was not
25
```

rebutted by Dr. Almeroth. 1 If you go to the next slide, TX3928, Page 2 2 (Document displayed) 3 MR. PAK: September 27, 2005, this time from a user 4 5 named flora's dad (As read): "Great idea. A macro-like scripter would 6 7 enable you to set groups of zones... You could do these dynamic 'presets' based on the 8 Party Mode" -- that's the Party Mode that 9 existed in Sonos in 2005 -- "which the spouse 10 11 would love--like Entertaining, Romantic Dinner, Ambiance..." 12 These are all thematic names, all talking about using 13 presets and macros, which were exactly the solution that 14 15 Mr. Lambourne had in mind. 16 And if you turn to the next slide. (Document displayed) 17 MR. PAK: Transcript at Page 541, Line 22 (As read): 18 19 "QUESTION: But the zone scenes were being described by users of the Sonos 2005 prior 20 art system before your December 20, 2005, 21 date, which is a conception date, and they 22 23 were talking about zone scenes, overlapping zone scenes and using macros, which is one of 24 25 the solutions you had in mind, to implement

1 the zone scenes; correct? They were talking about 2 "ANSWER: Yes. macros and scene groups, yes." 3 And so if you turn to the next slide. 4 5 (Document displayed) The Sonos forum posts unquestionably were MR. PAK: 6 7 talking about the Sonos 2005 system. And we have clear testimony from Mr. Lambourne saying not only did he see the 8 idea of overlapping zone scenes, but he saw his own solution in 9 there, which was to use macros. 10 11 And Your Honor asked multiple witnesses: Am I going to see source code instructions in the patent? And the answer is: 12 Of course not. He didn't talk in code. He never wrote code. 13 He described the invention from a user interface perspective. 14 And all these conception documents show is that macros and 15 16 scripts, presets were the solution he had in mind, that 17 constitute the programming instructions. So this is overwhelming evidence. Just combining Sonos 2005 system with 18 19 the Sonos forum posts which disclose multiple overlapping zone scenes that could be saved for use later, and using macros and 20 scripts and presets to implement them. 21 But we have more than that, Your Honor. This is evidence 22 23 that was -- came in unrebutted, and this is why we think we have a very, very strong case here, as a matter of law, based 24 25 on the evidence that was presented during trial.

If you turn to Page 53. 1 (Document displayed) 2 This is the USPTO statement. If Your Honor MR. PAK: 3 recalls, the '885 and '966 patent, where it went -- both of 4 5 them underwent prosecution, where there was discussion of the Yamaha DME prior art. 6 In this -- this is TX004 at Page 4577 (As read): 7 "...Examiner takes official notice that the 8 grouping and subgrouping of a constellation 9 of audio players...was well known in the art 10 11 before the effective filing date of the instant invention and would have been an 12 obvious inclusion." 13 Next slide. 14 15 (Document displayed) 16 MR. PAK: He goes on to say: 17 "The DME system" -- which was the prior art under consideration -- "enables the practice 18 of the claimed subject matter without undue 19 20 experimentation and as such grouping of 21 playback device and channels thereon would have been obvious" -- "obvious as a matter of 22 23 routine experimentation over the course of normal operation by the average skilled 24 practitioner upon the DME interface to 25

create, save and recall" -- "save and recall" 1 -- that's saving for later invocation --2 "various configurations including..." 3 If you remember the Yamaha DME reference disclosed 4 5 already, up to 999 zone scenes. 6 THE COURT: I know you'll get to it, but -- that's 7 what the examiner said at one point. But the examiner eventually changed his mind and allowed the claims or allowed 8 some amended claims. 9 MR. PAK: That's right, Your Honor. 10 11 **THE COURT:** What was that sequence? MR. PAK: Mr. Lordgooei will address this as part of 12 13 any argument we have on the "while operating in standalone mode." 14 But the reason why the claims were allowed is in the face 15 16 of the Yamaha rejection, they added the language about "while 17 operating in standalone mode." And making that amendment, the examiner then made the finding that the Yamaha reference did 18 19 not disclose operating in standalone mode because when you 20 invoke a scene, you do not have continuous output of media. 21 THE COURT: Say that last part again. He said that Yamaha did not meet the 22 MR. PAK: Yes. standalone mode set of limitations because Yamaha did not 23 continue to play media, continuous output of media, when you 24

25

are invoking the zone scene.

```
So this is -- if you go to DDX 14.41.
 1
 2
          (Document displayed)
              MR. PAK: DDX 14.41, Page 41.
 3
          (Document displayed)
 4
 5
              MR. PAK:
                        This is part of my closing that I presented
 6
     to the jury, as explained by Dr. Schonfeld.
          TX006 at 4102 and 4087. The claim amendments were made,
 7
     it says (As read):
 8
               "...the DME manual does not teach at least:
 9
               'while operating in a standalone mode...'"
10
11
          And you can see above that, that the claim was amended to
     add the language about "while operating in a standalone mode."
12
     This is the Yamaha DME manual.
13
          If you go to the next slide.
14
15
          (Document displayed)
              MR. PAK: And the U.S. PTO examiner at TX006 at Page
16
17
     5850 stated (As read):
               "The following is an examiner's statement of
18
               reasons for allowance:
                                        the prior art does
19
               not reasonably teach the subject matter of
20
               the independent claims. Particularly while
21
22
               DME operates to accomplish playback of
23
               selected media in synchrony on a selected set
               of first, second, playback devices when a
24
25
               scene is invoked..." -- And according to all
```

What are those zone

the claims, you invoke the scene while you 1 still operate in standalone mode -- "DME does 2 not allow for continuous output of media on a 3 particular playback device and joining the 4 5 continuous output by a selected payback device..." 6 7 That is exactly the position that we have taken. Dr. Schonfeld explained that "while operating in standalone 8 mode" is playing media, actively playing media. Or in the 9 words of the examiner, "continuous output of media." 10 11 So that was the reason Your Honor, that these claims survived the rejection. Was based on this idea that "operating 12 in standalone mode" is about continuous output of media. 13 Now, throughout this trial we've heard Sonos taking --14 Help me on something. What does that 15 THE COURT: 16 mean? You use the examiner's phraseology here, as to what was 17 the shortfall of the Yamaha system in the examiner's view. But, give me an example. 18 19 MR. PAK: Sure, Your Honor. So for example, in Yamaha, I had up to 999 zone scenes. But when I wanted to 20 21 invoke one zone scene from out of that set, it did not continuously play music as an individual standalone device when 22 23 I was invoking the zone scene. And that --THE COURT: What does that mean? So let's say you 24

have got six speakers. Six zone players.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

players doing, under the Yamaha machine in the moment before you press a zone scene, that would say: Invoke the first four out of the six.

MR. PAK: Let's imagine that we can just take one of those speakers out of the six. One of the six speakers was playing music individually. So it's playing music as a standalone speaker. So it's operating in standalone mode.

When the user invoked the zone scene that had all six speakers as a group, it would terminate playing that music individually. And then it would switch over to the zone scene that included all six speakers.

So what the examiner was saying here is as he understood "while operating in standalone mode" to mean which is continuous output of media, that limitation was not satisfied.

THE COURT: Well, why wouldn't it be? In the example you gave, it was playing in standalone. And the exact instant that they hit the button, it switches over to the other media.

So according to the examiner, what he found MR. PAK: in the Yamaha manual was that there was some point where it ceased to operate in standalone mode; then the zone scene was invoked. And therefore, it didn't continue to output the media individually on that speaker. The one speaker that we're talking about.

THE COURT: For how long? A split-second?

MR. PAK: Could be -- it could be a split-second.

That's based on the manual. That's what the examiner found.

Now, the critical point is it supports -- this examination record supports us in two ways. One, it supports us on our view consistently that the new designs do not meet the "operating in a standalone mode" because we terminate, as Your Honor heard, not only the playback of music, but we tear down the app. It is actually even configured to play music.

And we go into what Mr. Mackay talked about as idle mode.

Now, it also supports us from an obviousness standpoint because there is no question that the Sonos forum posts had everything, including saving for later.

And if Your Honor recalls, the only thing that they pointed to in the patent and supporting "while operating in standalone" was figure 6. And in figure 6 you went around in circles waiting to see when a zone scene is invoked after you created it.

Every forum post that I went through talks about creating things like winter mode, summer mode, morning mode, that would not be invoked at the time of creation. It is saved for later. We presented all of that evidence. Multiple zone scenes could be overlapping and saved for later.

But this piece of prosecution history shows that the examiner -- and then if you turn to the next slide -- Sonos, itself --

(Document displayed)

So help me understand their point. 1 MR. PAK: Sure, Your Honor. It starts with the 2 "...but the DME manual does not suggest that a DME scene can 3 re-group individual devices..." 4 5 THE COURT: No, it says: "...does not suggest that recalling a DME 6 Scene can re-group individual devices into 7 different DME device groups." 8 What does "re-group" mean? I've not heard that term 9 before. 10 11 MR. PAK: As I understand this statement, Your Honor, it is that -- and Dr. Schonfeld explained this. The DME scene 12 was done with respect to a particular device group. So in 13 Yamaha, you didn't have the ability to re-group an individual 14 15 speaker into multiple zone scenes because they belong to one 16 device group that you were creating --17 THE COURT: So in the Yamaha system, even though you could save 999, you could not do overlapping? 18 That's right. 19 MR. PAK: That's kind of overkill, isn't it? 20 THE COURT: have -- most people obviously have, say, max, ten. So how many 21 -- you can't have very many -- if you can't overlap, you're not 22 23 going to have very many -- you won't have any need for anything close to 999. 24 25 MR. PAK: So the --

I don't get it. Why, why -- is that 1 THE COURT: right? That's the way Yamaha worked? If No. 6 speaker was in 2 Group A, then No. 6 is accounted for, you can't -- it won't be 3 in anything else? Is that the way Yamaha worked? 4 5 MR. PAK: Yamaha was a high-end system, Your Honor. So if you turn to the next slide, you can see what the 6 interface looked like. 7 (Document displayed) 8 MR. PAK: So the idea was this was a high-end system 9 where you can control lots of different speaker groups in all 10 11 kinds of environments. So imagine if you're running a conference room or a restaurant or a commercial building, you 12 have the ability to create multiple zone scenes. They were all 13 saved, stored, recall later. But it didn't allow for the 14 15 functionality of saving them in overlapping configurations. 16 But there's another important piece of history, which is 17 the next slide. 18 (Document displayed) This is the Bose reference that was also 19 MR. PAK: 20 discussed during prosecution. And it talks about -- this is a 21 USPTO at TX006 at 5850: Bose displays static groupings, 22 attached as rooms. The rooms may be individually activated 23 and/or grouped into a Party Mode where all rooms synchronously deliver a common media. 24

So if you go to the next slide.

(Document displayed)

MR. PAK: What Bose taught was the idea of having overlap. Because you could have a house button, which is the equivalent to a Party Mode, where all the room speakers are linked together and available for playback as a group. That is the house button. You could also individually select two rooms, like Room A and Room C, by pushing the room button to group them together for playback.

So Bose prior art that was of record disclosed the overlapping zone group.

THE COURT: What did the examiner say about Bose?

MR. PAK: I was showing you. This is the 5850, if you go to the prior slide.

(Document displayed)

MR. PAK: So the examiner said (As read):

"Bose displays static groupings of media

players attached as 'rooms' and the rooms may

by individually activated and individually

configured for delivery of a synchronous

media and/or grouped into a Party Mode where

all rooms synchronously deliver a common

media."

So the prosecution history all points to one thing that was missing in the Yamaha and the Bose reference. And it was this idea of "while operating in a standalone mode." Are you

continuing to play music as a standalone device, when all the various limitations of the claims are invoked or performed.

In this case, Sonos has taken the position that "while operating in standalone mode" does not require continuous output of media on the individual device. We disagree with that, based on this prosecution history.

But certainly, under their view, there is no question that the Sonos forum posts, all the other combinations taught that element. And under our view that while operating in standalone mode, we also have the disclosure in the Sonos forum posts where if I do the winter mode and summer mode -- I'm not going to invoke them now, because it's not summer or winter, then you would continue to be able to operate the device in a stand-alone mode, play music, and then switch to any of those modes upon invocation while it's in standalone mode or while it's operating in standalone mode.

THE COURT: All right. I've got to give the other side a chance to respond.

MR. PAK: Sure. Great.

THE COURT: So let's hear from the other side.

MR. SHEA: Thank you, Your Honor. Rory Shea on behalf of Sonos.

I'm going to try to address all of that, Your Honor. I think there was more than one point in there. But, let me try to do my best.

I want to start with the discussion of the prior art and 1 obviousness. So first and foremost, I mean, we're here, I 2 think, talking about the judgment of matter of law motions. 3 And when we talk about the scope and content of the prior art 4 and whether or not that meets the claimed invention as a whole, 5 that is a question of. 6 7 And there is testimony in the record, absolutely, testimony from both Dr. Almeroth and Sonos's witnesses that 8 contradict what Mr. Pak just said. So --9 THE COURT: Wait. What did -- contradict which part 10 11 of what he just said? Sorry. So, I think several parts of 12 MR. SHEA: Yeah. 13 it, Your Honor. So maybe I can take it one by one. First and foremost --14 (Reporter clarification) 15 16 THE COURT: But, Mr. Pak did quote the actual 17 testimony. And I don't believe he forged what I just saw on the screen. So that -- here, you two, let me say in my own 18 words what I think he was saying. 19 We're supposed to compare the prior art, what was known in 20 the prior -- all of it, not just -- all of it against the 21 22 claimed invention. And, and then see how much of it was 23 already in the prior art. And then ask the question: Would it have been obvious to somebody skilled in the art to make that 24

leap from or -- big leap from what was already there to the

claimed invention?

And what I think he's saying is that that little leap or big leap was described in the forum posts. So that's the part I think that would be of some use for you to try to help me understand. How close did the prior art get, you know, the Yamaha thing with the examiner? And then how close -- was that gap closed by the forum posts?

MR. SHEA: Sure, Your Honor.

So as a starting point, yeah. I think it's important to remember that the way that the combination was presented at trial started with the Sonos 2005 system. Correct.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SHEA: And it was premised on this notion that

Party Mode was a zone scene, was the first zone scene. And --

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. SHEA: And then the dynamic group was the starting point for the second zone scene. Although, I think there's no dispute that the second -- that the zone group doesn't qualify as a zone scene.

There is -- so just as a starting point, Your Honor, the fundamental premise being this Party Mode is a zone scene,

Dr. Almeroth explained -- I think what's getting lost here is not is it just is it a zone scene (Indicating quotation marks), and there's a set of requirements that are in the construction for that. But, the claim elements step through the process

that is required.

So in order for you to have a zone scene, you first have to have a first portion of the process where you create the zone scene. And each claim has limitations that get at that issue. Then after you create it, there's some period of time where it exists, it's pre-saved and in existence, and then available for later invocation.

And Dr. Almeroth testified, he explained very clearly why Party Mode option in the Sonos 2005 system did not meet the requirements of a zone scene, the construction of a zone scene; that's one thing. And for more reasons than just that it wasn't user-created. There were other reasons. But more -- just as importantly, maybe I shall say, it didn't meet the -- the claim limitations that were -- walk you through how this happens. You have to create it first. It has to exist in an uninvoked state for some period of time, and then the user can later invoke it. I mean, that really is what the invention of zone scenes is.

And it was -- Mr. Lambourne and Sonos were innovating over the exact things that were in the Sonos 2005 system. I mean, that's what their goal was. So there's clear testimony in the record from Dr. Almeroth as well as other witnesses that Party Mode didn't meet all those requirements of the claim. And Dr. Almeroth laid that out.

So once you -- once you come to that conclusion, that

Party Mode isn't a zone scene and doesn't meet the requirements of the claim in terms of the creation existing in an uninvoked state and then eventually being invoked, then, Your Honor, everything else that Dr. Schonfeld presented in terms of his invalidity combination fall -- it's all premised on that. So that's Point 1.

Now, they have presented all these other secondary references. And Dr. Schonfeld said that they were presenting those for one purpose, and one purpose, only, which was that you couldn't save a second group. So all of that art -- and his demonstratives show this, his testimony shows this -- all of that art was presented to just fill in one part of the claim. And that's all he reached opinions on with respect to that art, is filling in this notion that you could have a second zone scene that would allow you -- which really just meant you could save (Indicating quotation marks) the second group.

But that -- that, again, is all premised on this notion that Sonos -- Sonos's system, its 2005 system, had everything else in the claim. Had the messages. Had the particular sequence of functions that were required in order to create --

THE COURT: When you say "messages," what do you mean?

MR. SHEA: Yeah, sorry, Your Honor. So in claim -- in
the '885 claim, Limitations 1.6 and 1.7 both require that the
player receives an indication that it has been added to the

player from the network device. And then thereafter, later in the claim -- this is now Limitation 1.9 and 1. -- 10, then there is a receipt of an instruction from the network device.

And so in the parlance of '885, when I talk about the messages, it's the indication limitations which are 1.6 and 1.7, and then that separate later instruction limitation that's 1.9 going into 1.10.

And those are messages. You know, they're -- the word "message" isn't used. But they're -- you know, they're -- let's call them "communications" because they're specified as coming from the network device, which would be the controller in the parlance of the '885, to the players. Right?

And then in the '966 claim which we've heard a lot is the other side of the coin, that claim likewise recites indications being sent at the time of creation of the messages -- or excuse me, of the zone scenes being sent to the players. And then it has a limitation at the end that says that the controller then causes the player to transition thereafter into that grouped mode upon invocation.

So in both claims you see this split, right? There's the creation, and the indications that are sent over the network to achieve that creation, amongst other things that the claims require. And then you have this second phase of invocation, and you have limitations around that, including communications that take place directly or indirectly between the controller

and the player.

And that framework, those claim limitations that walk through step by step, you know, what is happening, you create a first group and you send that indication -- to the zone scene, you create a second zone scene, you send that indication.

There's something that kind of happens in between. It differs, depending on the claim. '885 says you continue to operate in standalone mode. '966 says you display those.

And then after that, then there is a selection of one of the two that have been created, and saved. And then that prompts an additional set of actions that then causes the invocation, and the players to enter that group mode.

So all of those limitations, Dr. Schonfeld didn't map any of these secondary references to any of that. At all. He didn't even try. He relied on Sonos's 2005 system for all of that. And he just left this little gap for himself where he said: This is all I need from the secondary references. And then he went and tried to pull those in. He tried to fill that small gap which he, himself, characterized as just saving the second group. That's all -- that's all he said was missing. He went to all these secondary references and said: Well, yeah, it would be known to save the second group.

But, all of that was premised on that the Sonos 2005 system had all that other stuff. And it just simply didn't.

And Dr. Almeroth --

Give me an example of what it did not 1 THE COURT: 2 have.

So, so this idea that you would MR. SHEA: Yeah. create a group, and have an indication sent to create a group at a first point in time, but at a time when the group wasn't invoked, and then at a later point in time in the claim would you send an instruction to then invoke that group that has previously been uninvoked, that separation of creation and invocation and sending separate messages to achieve those two purposes, Sonos's 2005 system did not have that, as Dr. Almeroth testified.

What we've seen in the evidence -- and even Dr. Schonfeld conceded this with Party Mode -- is that creation and invocation happened at the same time. It was "anatomic" action, is the word Dr. Almeroth used. But what -- it occurred, both things happened at once. These groups were automatically invoked at the time of creation. That's just how they worked.

And so because of that, you don't see this separation in these two different functions to achieve, one for creation, and then one that you can achieve later for invocation.

And again --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, let me test you on that a minute. THE COURT: In thinking about it, let's say you have a system with

just three speakers, or zone players. There's memory on each

one of the zone players that tells the zone player that it is a 1 participant in Party Mode. If and when it's invoked. 2 Now, that's the way I read your patent. Is that not true? 3 What you now seem to be saying is Party Mode is created and 4 5 invoked at the same time. But there has to be something on 6 those zone players that will catch the message that -- the 7 invocation and then string them together. MR. SHEA: You're speaking of the prior art Party Mode 8 now, Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: I'm talking about on the Sonos 2005 10 11 system. MR. SHEA: Yeah, yeah. So prior to the selection of 12 13 the Party Mode option, there's nothing on the players that memorializes any existence of Party Mode. So what happens is 14 15 when Party Mode is selected -- and I think we had some 16 witnesses testify to this, but I'm pretty familiar with it, 17 Your Honor -- and so everything was at the controller. 18 hard-coded -- it was a hard-coded rule. And when the user selected Party Mode, the controller 19 interpreted that as a selection to create a new dynamic group 20 with everybody that was currently in the system at the time. 21

And the controller then just cycled through and sent to -- to

this group now. And that's how it worked.

each of the players an instruction that said: Create and invoke

And the player, that instruction, it wasn't a broadcast;

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it didn't blast it out. That's not how it worked. They were directed messages to each of the members that were to be included in that Party Mode. And it said -- and it told each You need to create and invoke this group right now. And that's what the players did. THE COURT: Before you -- on the 2005 prior art system, before -- let's say you're listening to your system, and you want to hit Party Mode, but you don't hit it yet. And moments before you hit Party Mode button, doesn't the controller know, have some information inside it, as to which -- the identity of the speakers that are part of the system? MR. SHEA: So Your Honor, I do believe that the controller, for a separate purpose, does have knowledge of which players are in the system prior to that. Because there is some information just so that -- because setting aside all of this, right, Party Mode, grouping, all of this, right, that controller served to individually control each of the players Right? So before these groups get formed, the in the system. controller can control the volume on each of them, and can control playback on each of them, individually. Right? The controller has awareness of the players in the system. But in terms of when -- you know, that information is -- is not -- it's not with the Party Mode. You know, the Party Mode, again, it's not even a group. It's not -- it's

just -- it's a piece -- it's some code in the controller that

says: When the user selects this, here's a set of steps I want you to take in order to create a new dynamic group that has everybody in the system.

And that's how it worked. And so at that time -- but I think what's important, Your Honor, is regardless of what the controller did or didn't know, again, the claims require there be two separate sets of -- two separate communications happening at two different times. Right? For even a single -- before we even get the overlapping and the second zone scene in play.

You've got to have an indication to the player telling it:
Hey, you've been added to a new zone scene, but it hasn't been
invoked yet. And then there needs to be a selection from
somewhere that, to invoke it. And then an affirmative action
by some actor -- I, mean the user in almost all cases,
Your Honor, right? That the user says: Okay, invoke it now.
I created it earlier. Invoke it now.

And then there's a separate second message sent. And the claims require that. The claims require two separate interactions, let me call them, with the -- between the player and the controller at two separate times. And so that -- you know, which is what facilitates all of this. That's what facilitates the ability for users to achieve the real purpose and goal of this invention, which is to allow users to customize and pre-save groups so that they don't have to go and

create them every time.

And the key distinction why it's different than the Party Mode in that system, I mean, the claim -- that's why the claim has these separate communications. Because, Party Mode, you didn't need -- it was predefined. Right? I mean, in a sense that, like, Party Mode, you -- the rule in the code said "all players." Right? User couldn't customize that. So there was no need to communicate with the player. It's just a totally different -- it's just a shortcut, really, on the controller.

And so that's why -- I mean, with zone scenes, there needs to be a lot more work to be done. Because you need to allow for creation of something that's -- that is customized by -- by some actor entity -- again, the user in almost all cases, regardless of whether the -- I mean, that word is in the claim language or not. There has to be an affirmative creation. And then a later invocation.

And Party Mode didn't allow that, Your Honor, in Sonos's 2005 system. It just simply did not meet all those other limitations of the claims. And Dr. Schonfeld did not rely or explain -- even try to explain how any of those other secondary prior art references filled those gaps of having two separate messages or -- or indications or instructions for, you know, creating and invoking at two different times. It didn't have -- you know, depending on the prior art references, missing other things as well.

You know, naming of these -- these groups, that was 1 something that was missing in various places. I think Your 2 Honor already pointed that, out in some capacity. 3

There -- I could look through the claims and look at others, Your Honor. But I think the important thing -- and Dr. Almeroth talked through this. Because one of the things that Dr. Almeroth told us is -- we started by saying okay, well, he explained why Party Mode isn't a zone scene, zone group isn't a zone scene. He started doing -- that was the first portion of his testimony on that issue.

But then he was asked to assume, assume they are. Assume that -- let's just call them zone scenes, let's use that word, let's assume they meet the requirements of the construction for zone scene. Even though he disagreed -- you know, he had told us already he disagrees that's true. He then explained: Well, even if you call them zone scenes, you still don't meet all these other limitations of the claim. The key being this separation between creation and invocation. You just don't meet those other limitations of the claim.

And then --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's what the examiner said? Or the THE COURT: witness said?

MR. SHEA: At this point I'm talking about Dr. Almeroth, Your Honor. Yeah, the expert witness, Sonos's expert witness. And that's all in the transcript. And

Google's counsel didn't ask him about any of that, that he 1 testified. And even --2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What did the examiner say about the Sonos 2005 system?

So, so Your Honor, the examiner did not MR. SHEA: even raise the Sonos 2005 system as a reference he thought presented a concern for these claims. He was -- had the manual, he was provided with that. He reviewed it. acknowledged that it was considered by him as part of his analysis of these claims.

But as far as I know, at least certainly in the '885 and the '966 file histories, the examiner never even elevated that to a reference that he rejected the claims upon.

And I think there's so much confusion on the DME reference, Your Honor, and I'm happy to try to clarify because I think I probably have a better understanding of what DME is and isn't than what's coming through in this. I think there's a lot of misleading statements being made about that. There's a lot of clipping the file histories, and not looking at it in the proper context.

First and foremost, the word "scene" in DME didn't even refer to a group of players. It had nothing to do with groups of players. So this -- it -- it stuns me that we're talking about this, but anyway, so, the -- in DME there was a concept of a group, separate from a scene. They were logically

separate concepts. You could group players. You couldn't 1 pre-save player -- groups and do the things that the zone scene 2 technology required. But you could create groups. You could 3 You couldn't overlap. 4 create. 5 THE COURT: But you could save them, too. 999, right? MR. SHEA: So that's the scenes, Your Honor. But this 6 is the key. A scene is not -- what you're saving has nothing 7 to do with a group of players. What a scene was in DME were 8 Audio effects. Like, I'm going to have equalization effects. 9 at this level, I'm going have volume at this level. I'm going 10 11 to do certain things, I'm going to manipulate the output of the audio in certain ways. This is why there were 999 of them, 12 Your Honor. It had nothing to do with groups. 13 THE COURT: But did it allow you to group? 14 MR. SHEA: So, what -- not the scene. So what you did 15 16 was you would create a group, totally separate. 17 THE COURT: Like four or five speakers. MR. SHEA: Four or five speakers, whatever you want. 18 You could only -- it was a dynamic group, just like in Sonos's 19 2005 system. A player could only ever be in one. You didn't 20 pre-create them, you didn't pre-save them. You just created a 21 22 Right? The concept of a group. group. 23 And then you could then -- what's called -- there's apply a scene (Indicating quotation marks). Okay, Your Honor. 24

what that means is: Okay, I've got my group. I already have

that preexisting group. I mean, you could see it even in one 1 of the statements Mr. Pak showed us. This came through in that 2 statement, if you understand it. You have a group. 3 Now you can take a scene, which talks about how to 4 5 manipulate the audio output of the players or the audio in that 6 group. And you could apply that scene to that group. So you 7 could marry the two. You could --THE COURT: Let's say you've got speakers 1 through 5 8 that are in a group. 9 Uh-huh. 10 MR. SHEA: 11 THE COURT: And can that be saved for future use as a 12 pre-set? 13 MR. SHEA: That's not my understanding of DME, Your Honor. And I don't think any of the -- regardless of 14 15 whether it's my understanding or not, I guess, none of the --16 THE COURT: Well, but wait. MR. SHEA: Yeah. 17 THE COURT: Well, that is different than what I was 18 19 picking up from Mr. Pak. I thought he was saying that if you had a system, let's say, with ten speakers, you could connect 20 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as Group No. 1, and save it as a pre-set so 21 that next time you wouldn't have to dynamically do all -- just 22 23 the five; you would hit button No. 1 and then you would be

automatically playing -- now, you didn't have overlap, I get

24

25

that part.

Speakers 6, 7 could not be -- that would be on a 1 different -- and 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are already accounted for; 2 they couldn't be used in some other -- I get that. 3 thought he was saying it could be as a preset, and save for 4 5 future use. What you're adding to it is, okay, you get the 6 volume, you get the equalization; you could also save that too. 7 But are you sure about the pre-set thing, that it could not be preset? 8 So Your Honor, I'm saying my 9 MR. SHEA: understanding -- and I don't think we have seen any evidence 10 11 that suggests to the contrary, I mean, maybe there is -- but that a scene did not allow for that. 12 13 THE COURT: Well, did anything in Yamaha allow for that? 14 Your Honor, not to my recollection. 15 MR. SHEA: 16 is why, again -- it gets back to why you couldn't do overlap. 17 Right? The reason you couldn't do overlap in Yamaha was 18 because the groups -- the groups were automatically invoked in So that's why you couldn't have overlap of the groups. 19 DME. 20 **THE COURT:** What do you mean, automatically invoked? So, so, not pre-saved for future use. 21 MR. SHEA: 22 it was created, it was active. And that's why, whenever you 23 have a system like that, where you -- the groups are invoked at the time of creation, like, like Sonos's 2005 system, that's 24 25 when you can't have overlap.

You're saying that the -- that the dynamic 1 THE COURT: groups were -- I mean, you're saying that the Yamaha was all 2 dynamic groups, and no static groups? I could have sworn I saw 3 the examiner refer to "static." 4 5 MR. SHEA: I think that was in the context of Bose, Your Honor, where you saw the word "static." 6 THE COURT: So you're saying Yamaha was dynamic, only. 7 MR. SHEA: That is my understanding. And just to take 8 a step back on Yamaha, I mean, a couple of other points, 9 10 Your Honor, may be worth noting. 11 I mean, first of all, Yamaha and Sonos 2005 wasn't even one of the combinations that Dr. Schonfeld relied on. He's 12 relying on person of ordinary skill in the art --13 THE COURT: Well, look, I don't have to -- the idea 14 15 that you have to have an expert testify to everything in the 16 universe --17 MR. SHEA: Yeah. THE COURT: -- is wrong. I can decide this, myself. 18 The Federal Circuit might reverse me. God bless them, that's 19 okay. But, just because I'm not locked into what an expert 20 21 says, I'm going to decide in my own mind. 22 And I keep thinking this. Back in the nineties, we had 23 speed dial. I could make all the groups I wanted with my telephone. And that way, I could recall them instantly. And 24 25 that was years -- decades before this patent. To me, that was

third-grade -- third-grade technology, by the time your patent 1 came -- your invention came along. 2 So the idea of saving a pre-set group to me is -- is 3 obvious as these people on the Sonos forum. 4 5 Now, it's somewhat more complicated because of the language of the claims. So I -- and the standalone, it's 6 7 complicated. More complicated. But maybe not that much more complicated. So I'm trying to understand it, myself. 8 And, both sides, you keep throwing back what the experts 9 said and did not say. Yes, that's important. But it's -- it 10 11 could be that somebody wins or loses this case, based on something that an expert did not say, but is in the evidence 12 13 anyway. So I'm trying to understand the evidence. 14 MR. SHEA: And that --15 16 THE COURT: I hate to get on your case about this. 17 But both of you are saying this. Okay, I've given you equal time. I need to -- I'm going 18 to give the other side a very brief rebuttal. And then we're 19 20 going to reverse it, and let you make a main point. All right, Mr. Pak, you get about two or three minutes and 21 that's it. 22 23 MR. PAK: Okay, Your Honor. THE COURT: What do you say about the Yamaha 24 situation? 25

```
We can just look right here. Let's pull up
 1
              MR. PAK:
     Slide 10.19.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          I don't see a thing.
 3
              MR. PAK: Sorry. DX10.19.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Not on my screen.
              MR. PAK: I'll just -- do we have that?
 6
          (Document displayed)
 7
              THE COURT: Here we go. Now it is.
 8
              MR. PAK:
                       (As read)
 9
               "...the prior art enables the selection of a
10
11
               device or group for synchronized playback of
               media..."
12
13
          And it goes on to say that:
               "...invocation of a scene which adds a
14
               playback device or group thereof..."
15
16
          This is USPTO examiner. Clearly, scenes were linked to
17
     groups. And we can see it in the next slide as well.
          (Document displayed)
18
                       This is Sonos. The DME scenes can be
19
              MR. PAK:
20
     configured, stored, recalled within a given DME device group.
21
          So these scenes were working in the context of saved
              The scenes could be used to add additional parameters.
22
23
     But clearly, these were all pre-sets for groups.
              THE COURT: Well, the phrase "save and recall,"
24
     "create, save and recall various configurations" seems to me to
25
```

indicate that -- yes. But counsel will say: No, that's 1 referring to equalization and volume of sound, and not to --2 not to groups of speakers. 3 MR. PAK: No, it's very clear. First of all, Yamaha 4 5 definitely disclosed having predefined and saved groups. within that -- and I can -- I can show you the prosecution 6 history. 7 Do you have the prosecution history there as well? Yeah, 8 9 let's put that up. So this is the preceding sentence before "Thus DME scenes 10 11 can be configured or stored or recalled within a DME." (Document displayed) 12 13 MR. PAK: (Reading) So you have multiple zones in an area that can be in a device group. No question that was 14 15 stored. However, individual pieces in DME cannot be assigned 16 to multiple device groups or overlapping device groups. A zone 17 can include up to 32 device groups, and all devices belong to 18 one of those groups. So it's clear what the examiner was saying about DME. 19 had predefined and saved groups within a group. 20 THE COURT: All right. But you still couldn't do 21 overlap. 22 23 MR. PAK: That's right. And that's where Bose comes

in. And that's where the Sonos forum postings come in.

have Sonos forum postings, Your Honor, that I went through

24

already on.

So this is just background of the art. The background of the art already said you can store, recall, all kinds of configurations involving multiple zone scenes. What they argued was you couldn't have overlap. We saw Bose create an overlap.

THE COURT: What do you say to the point that counsel made that I believe I understood, and he said that when you hit the Party Mode button on the 2005, it created and invoked at the exact same moment. And therefore, it didn't satisfy the two-step process of the claims.

MR. PAK: So there are two points I would say to that, Your Honor. Number one, none of the claim language is about user invocation at all. Or user action. This could be system messages. And Your Honor hit it exactly right.

THE COURT: Let's even assume that.

MR. PAK: Yes.

THE COURT: It does say in the '885, for example, after you have the indications for two different zone scenes, then it says -- just a minute.

Here we go (As read):

"After receiving the first and second indications, continuing to operate in the standalone mode until a given one of the first and second zone scenes has been

selected for invocation..." 1 And, then dropping down again: 2 "...based on the instruction transitioning 3 from operating in the standalone mode to 4 5 operating in accordance with the given one of the first and second predefined groupings." 6 7 So that seems to be counsel is saying that there's -there's got to be a few milliseconds of time in between. 8 Yes, Your Honor. And we have evidence on 9 MR. PAK: exactly that. So if we turn to slide 37 of my PowerPoint. 10 11 (Document displayed) MR. PAK: So Dr. Schonfeld clearly explained this in 12 13 his testimony. This is at transcript Page 171, Line 9, to 174, Line 2: 14 15 "Well, I disagree with Doctor..." (Reporter clarification) 16 MR. PAK: 17 "Well, I disagree with Dr. Almeroth's 18 opinion; but even if I accept his opinion, it 19 is still not done exactly at the same time 20 because once you receive the set AVTransport 21 22 URI message, you still -- after that point, 23 you have to send an AddMember message, and there is a whole sequence of exchanges that 24 take place before you are invoked to what 25

Dr. Almeroth calls invoke." 1 THE COURT: He's referring to the 2005? 2 MR. PAK: That's right. This is Sonos 2005 Party 3 And the claim does not say -- it simply says "after." 4 5 THE COURT: Now these messages are AVTransport -- what is that, "URI message"? 6 MR. PAK: And then there's the subsequent AddMember 7 messages. 8 THE COURT: All right, those are -- those are what, 9 Java -- what language is that? 10 I believe -- I don't know -- I think it's 11 MR. PAK: probably implemented in a language other than Java. But these 12 13 are the computer messages that are sent back and forth between the group members that belong to the Party Mode. 14 15 So, set -- you have the AVTransport URI message. 16 there's a second message, AddMember message. These are all 17 system messages that are found in the Sonos 2005 prior art system source code which was not available to the patent 18 19 examiner. And this is the key part. We went through this a lot with 20 21 all the witnesses. The claims don't specify any amount of time that you have to wait before invocation, in the claims. 22 23 Furthermore, the specification says you can invoke it at That's at Column 2, Line 46 through 51 of the '885 24 any time. 25 patent. So if Your Honor has a copy of that, or I can have

```
that brought up.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Sorry, I --
              MR. PAK: The '885 patent --
 3
          (Document displayed)
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Well --
              THE CLERK: Here, Judge.
 6
 7
              MR. PAK: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: What column?
 8
              MR. PAK: Column 2, Line 46 through 51.
 9
          (Document displayed)
10
11
              MR. PAK: If you go to Column 2, Line 46?
          (Document displayed)
12
              THE COURT: 2 --
13
              MR. PAK: To Line 46 through --
14
15
              THE COURT: 46. All right.
16
              MR. PAK: Through 51.
17
          (Document displayed)
18
              THE COURT: All right.
               "According to another aspect of the present
19
20
               invention..."
21
              MR. PAK: ...a user may activate the scene.
22
              at any time..."
23
              THE COURT: Does not say that. Let me read it:
               "According to another aspect of the present
24
25
               invention, the scene may be activated at any
```

time or a specific time." 1 2 MR. PAK: Correct. THE COURT: (As read) 3 "A user may activate the scene at any time so 4 5 that only some selected zones in an entertainment system facilitate a playback of 6 7 an audio source. When the scene is activated at a specific time, the scene may be used as 8 an alarm or buzzer." 9 All right. So what's the key language here? 10 11 MR. PAK: The key language, Your Honor, is the patent specification talks about "activation" to mean "invocation." 12 13 The patent says that invocation can happen at any time after creation. It does not require any amount of time --14 THE COURT: So let's say, for the sake of argument, 15 you're right. And on the 2005 you hit the Party Mode button. 16 17 MR. PAK: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Walk through the steps of why 18 that would fit, or how -- how -- to what extent it would fit 19 the claim language of the '885. 20 21 So let's bring up slide 3 from the deck. MR. PAK: (Document displayed) 22 This was all uncontested evidence that came 23 MR. PAK: And it was confirmed by Mr. Millington --24 25 **THE COURT:** Don't say all these argumentative things.

I know the other side would deny that. 1 2 MR. PAK: So, so --Just tell me what he said. THE COURT: 3 MR. PAK: So this is the Party Mode, what happens in 4 5 the Party Mode system or with Party Mode for all zones is this. Remember, the controller has both the code, and it also 6 7 has all of the knowledge of what zone players exist in the system, stored in memory. And I think counsel recognized that. 8 Because it has to know where to send these set AVTransport URI 9 Those are messages that are sent by the system. 10 messages. The 11 claims do not require user messages. These messages are sent to these zone players, at a given 12 point in time. Then these zone players 106 and 104 then also 13 transmit additional messages to the group coordinator of that 14 15 zone player, including the AddMember message. And so what we 16 are having is a series of messages that are operated in 17 sequence after the user pushes the Party Mode button. It causes, number one, a delay in time, as Dr. Schonfeld 18 talked about, between the time that they are created to the 19 time that there is invocation. And --20 THE COURT: All right. I -- I think I understand. 21 22 What the -- the term "set AVTransport URI," what is our 23 testimony as to what that actually consisted of? That consisted of -- we have multiple 24 MR. PAK:

testimony on that, Your Honor. That's Mr. Millington, as well

I mean, the claim lays out a sequence of three key 1 time. actions here. There's more in the claim, but there's a 2 sequence of three key actions. First you create it. Then it's 3 selected, second. That's the middle part of the claim. 4 And 5 then it's invoked. So it's not a matter of how long. You've got to have it 6 created first, and then make it available to select it after 7 it's created. And then it's invoked, based on that selection 8 9 of the thing. Party Mode did not meet that. It doesn't matter how much 10 11 time it took for these messages. You selected it first --THE COURT: But the selection could be by the system. 12 13 Doesn't have to be by a user. (Nods head) 14 MR. PAK: That's right, Your Honor. I think for 15 MR. SHEA: 16 purposes of what I'm saying, it just doesn't matter. 17 Mode is selected first. And then creation and invocation 18 happen immediately after that. And they happen -- Dr. Almeroth 19 believes they happen "atomically," meaning at the same time. 20 If there's some minimalist time in between, it just doesn't Because what the key is is they were created first, 21 matter. then allowed selection -- allowed for selection, and then 22 invoked after the selection. 23 That's what the claim requires. And that's what Party 24 25 Mode did not meet. Amongst other things, Your Honor.

All right. We've got to switch to -- I'm 1 THE COURT: going to give your side -- I have a medical appointment that I 2 need to make later in the early afternoon. So I've got at 3 least 30 more minutes, but that's about it. 4 So I want to give Sonos a chance to make your -- a main 5 Could be anything in your paperwork that you want to 6 7 make sure that I have -- be thinking about. MR. SHEA: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 You know, I mean, I think we believe it's pretty clear on 9 the briefs. I mean, we don't necessarily feel we need to 10 11 burden Your Honor with more argument today. THE COURT: Good, then let's just go home. But -- no, 12 13 come on. 14 MR. SHEA: Okay. There must be something you would like to 15 THE COURT: 16 emphasize. 17 MR. SHEA: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So Your Honor, I really think -- I just don't believe there really is any 18 19 further dispute that the prior versions of Google's products meet the limitations of the '966 patent. 20 As Your Honor likely recalls, the -- the prior versions of 21 the products have already been found on summary judgment to 22 23 satisfy the limitations of the '885 claims. We've heard throughout this entire trial that they're two sides of the same 24

coin, they're very similar limitations --

But they're not identical. 1 THE COURT: They're not identical. 2 MR. SHEA: There are differences. THE COURT: 3 MR. SHEA: So the one remaining limitation, I think, 4 5 or the other limitation that Google has disputed is this notion that the controllers do not cause storage of -- of the zone 6 7 Right, that's the only dispute remaining on the prior version of the products for infringement purposes, Your Honor. 8 And I think the evidence we've laid out in our motion, the 9 evidence Your Honor heard throughout the trial shows that 10 11 absolutely those speaker groups are stored. Let me just start here, Your Honor. They have to be 12 13 stored. Otherwise, it would be impossible to recall them later. 14 THE COURT: Well, see, this is the kind of the same 15 16 flip side of the argument we were just having a while ago about 17 the two steps. And you say it's all one step and the -- okay. All right. Let's -- okay. Let's find out what the answer 18 Mr. Pak, what is your answer to this point that counsel is 19 Then I'm going to give him a chance to shoot down what 20 making? 21 you say. Thank you, Your Honor. So if we go to the MR. PAK: 22 23 presentation, my presentation at Page 55. (Document displayed) 24 25 MR. PAK: Actually, in the other deck. This is for

the causing storage. 1 Let me start by saying, Your Honor, that "causing storage 2 of the first zone scene" language appears only in the '966 3 4 claims. 5 (Document taken off display) THE COURT: Yes, that's right. 6 7 MR. PAK: It's separate from creation. And what's being caused to be stored is, quote, "zone scenes." So you 8 have to have the first zone scene that is stored and a second 9 zone scene that is stored. 10 11 (Document displayed) MR. PAK: So we have it on the PowerPoint now. 12 THE COURT: And there's also the icon, the '855 13 doesn't -- '885 doesn't have any icon. They're displaying a 14 15 representation. MR. PAK: That's right, Your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. PAK: So if you go to two slides before that. (Document displayed) 19 20 MR. PAK: This is the key point that we have been 21 saying all along in trial. "Zone scene" is not just anything. 22 It's "A previously-saved grouping" and you are saving it 23 according to the language of the claims for later invocation. That time could be any amount of time. But you have to save 24

the grouping for invocation purposes.

membership information for invocation of that group, they are

listening -- the controller's is listening to those broadcasts.

If a speaker drops out of the system unbeknownst to the

23

24

controller, it won't know that it dropped out. All it will 1 know is that at that point in time, I got messages back; I'm 2 looking for all the members that belong to Group 1. It heard 3 from two speakers. Two speakers said "I'm here and I belong to 4 5 Group 1." Then it uses that information to identify the leader 6 for a group playback. 7 And the key thing --THE COURT: Let's say that's exactly the way it 8 Why isn't -- each of the speakers understands that 9 worked. it's a member of that particular group. 10 11 MR. PAK: Right. THE COURT: So that info has to be stored somewhere on 12 13 the speaker. The group information, the group ID 14 MR. PAK: 15 information, absolutely, it's stored. THE COURT: Why isn't that enough to satisfy "causing 16 17 storage of the first zone scene"? It's -- it's subdivided 18 between speakers, but it's stored somewhere. Because the other part of that construction, 19 MR. PAK: 20 Your Honor, is the previously-saved. So what you are trying to 21 do is at the time you create the group, let's say where there 22 were three speakers at the time you created the group, what 23 you're supposed to do, according to the claim language, is save the list of three that is previously saved, pre-defined 24

25

grouping, according to the claims.

stored, isn't it? Previously stored? Because it's on the speakers?

The ID is stored. But here's the key MR. PAK: distinction between the Google system and the claims.

22

23

24

claims say if I have three speakers, no matter how you 1 distribute the storage, that's previously saved, previously 2 defined at the time of creation. Then when you invoke that 3 zone scene, you're supposed to use the three that you have 4 5 identified. Because those are the ones that were identified --6 THE COURT: All right. MR. PAK: Google's products, and all the products, all 7 work totally differently. Because at the time I created the 8 group or a zone scene, accused zone scene, I may have three 9 speakers. 10 11 **THE COURT:** You have what? MR. PAK: Three speakers, we'll say. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. MR. PAK: At a later point in time when I'm trying to 14 15 use the group or invoke the group, I may only have two. 16 Because in our system, in the Google system, I never go back in 17 time to when the group was created. We never store anything 18 about that historical point in time. What we're doing is at the time that you need it, you 19 20 listen to the broadcast. So in the scenario where I described 21 that one of the speakers fell out, Your Honor, out of the 22 three, one fell out of the network or the wifi strength is not 23 very good for that speaker, the new group identity will be two speakers, not three. 24

So this is what Mr. Mackay described as a different

solution, in his historical document. He considered an option 1 like the one independently, like the one that is claimed where 2 you store the information about the group members, and use that 3 previously-stored information for later use. 4 5 THE COURT: But let's say there hasn't -- you're assuming that an asteroid has fallen out of outer space, and 6 7 hit your house and knocked out a speaker. Let's assume it's just a routine thing, and you've got three speakers, and they 8 continue to work. 9 MR. PAK: Yes. 10 11 THE COURT: Why isn't that, then -- analyze that situation. 12 13 MR. PAK: Sure THE COURT: You've got the information that's all 14 15 stored; you can invoke them. 16 MR. PAK: No, because according to the system, it 17 never knows what was saved. It doesn't store any information 18 in the system about the three speakers. Only you and I 19 remember that when I created the group, that it was three 20 The system doesn't -speakers. THE COURT: You keep making it sound like it has to be 21 stored in one file, and dividing up the information -- what was 22 23 it called, "distributed storage," that was the phrase. MR. SHEA: (Nods head) 24

THE COURT: The distributed storage is not a

legitimate alternative.

MR. PAK: It's not just -- the issue is this,

Your Honor. If you plug in Your Honor's construction into the

claim language, it says that you have a pre-defined group.

It's previously saved grouping, academic to the zone scene

language. And if you read the rest of the claim language, it

says you invoke the group playback based on what you previously

saved, which is the list of speakers, or the grouping.

What we're saying, Your Honor, is the system has no prior knowledge of what speakers may have belonged to any given group or not. Even in the world in which the same speakers still are broadcasting the information that it belongs to a group, the system doesn't know that. It doesn't store that information. Only you and I know that, because we happen to use our brain to recall what the setting was.

THE COURT: No, but the speakers are broadcasting that information. They must have gotten it from somewhere, and stored it somewhere, for rebroadcast later.

MR. PAK: It stores their individual group ID. But the uncontested evidence -- well, I won't say "uncontested."

What Mr. Mackay said is -- and it's confirmed by

Dr. Schonfeld -- is: If I just know the ID and the group name for a given speaker, I still don't get to the list of actual speakers for that group. Because the group composition can change second by second. So in the Google -- in the Google

```
design, I'm never going back to a previously-saved grouping.
 1
     I'm pulling the grouping dynamically.
 2
          So Your Honor is absolutely right that there is device --
 3
     every device in the system stores the group ID it belongs to.
 4
 5
     But nowhere in the system does it say that morning group, for
     example, has three speakers, and these three speakers are to be
 6
     used for invocation of that group. It doesn't work like that.
 7
              THE COURT: All right. Let's --
 8
              MR. SHEA:
                         So Your Honor, you actually --
 9
              THE COURT: You get to respond.
10
11
              MR. SHEA:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
          You don't even need to take my word for it. So I'm just
12
     going to read from a couple of the dep designations that were
13
     played in court from Google's witnesses.
14
          Let me start with Mr. Mackay. I took his deposition.
15
16
     I asked him -- a little preface Your Honor, if you recall --
17
              THE COURT:
                          These were read to the jury, now?
              MR. SHEA:
                         Yeah.
                                These were played by video to the
18
19
     jury.
              THE COURT:
20
                          Okay.
              MR. SHEA: And just as a little bit of, like,
21
     refresher context, in a speaker group there's one device called
22
23
     the "leader," he's the coordinator, he's in charge. And the
     rest of them are called "followers."
24
25
          Okay, so with that context I asked him --
```

```
Always say "Question" and read it.
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
              MR. SHEA:
                         Yeah.
              THE COURT: And then say "Answer" --
 3
              MR. SHEA:
                         Sure, yeah.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: For the court reporter.
              MR. SHEA: (As read)
 6
               "QUESTION: Focusing specifically on
 7
               whichever player is currently elected as the
 8
               leader of a particular group, will that
 9
               player store in memory identifiers of each
10
11
               device that is currently a follower of that
12
               group?
                         It stores information about the
13
               "ANSWER:
               followers that are currently connected to
14
15
               it."
16
          So Your Honor this is Mr. Mackay, not, not with this newer
17
     theory --
18
              THE COURT: Read that last sentence again.
              MR. SHEA:
                         Sure. He said -- do you want me to read
19
20
     the whole thing, Your Honor?
21
              THE COURT: Just the answer part.
              MR. SHEA: The answer said:
22
               "It stores information about the followers
23
               that are currently connected to it."
24
          Your Honor. So first of all, the leader of the group
25
```

```
stores identifying information -- "Identifiers" was the word I
 1
    used in my question -- of the followers in the group. So the
 2
     leader certainly knows.
 3
          And it makes sense, Your Honor. The leader has to know
 4
 5
     who the followers in the group are. He has to.
              THE COURT: Why is that?
 6
              MR. PAK: Because when the group is invoked, when it's
 7
     launched, the leader then needs to talk to the followers so
 8
     they can coordinate for synchronous playback.
 9
          If the leader doesn't know who the followers are, he
10
11
     doesn't know who to direct those messages to. He doesn't --
     the invocation message doesn't tell the leader: Hey, these are
12
     the other members of the group. That's not how it works.
13
     There's just a launch message. It goes to the leader.
14
           This is the group ID; I want you to invoke it now.
15
16
     Invoke that group.
17
          And the leader says: Okay, good.
              THE COURT: Well, you could -- I want to quarrel with
18
     you a little bit.
19
          You could have a system where the leader sends out a
20
    broadcast to the entire universe, and it has a header that
21
           Listen to this message only if you are a member of this
22
23
     group. So it wouldn't necessarily have to --
24
              MR. SHEA: Okay.
              THE COURT: It could be to everyone, but only -- it
25
```

would only be paid attention to by the members of the group. 1 So I'm not sure you're right that it has to know. 2 MR. SHEA: Yeah -- sorry, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: But, but, maybe, I remember, you are 4 5 making me remember some testimony about they're constantly 6 deciding who is the leader of the group, based on wifi strength. So in that sense, it does seem to me the leader 7 would need to know who was in the group. 8 MR. SHEA: And I apologize for suggesting that's not 9 the only way to do it. But that is the way Google does it, 10 11 Your Honor. I mean, that's how their system works. They don't send a broadcast message. The leader communicates individually 12 with those followers --13 THE COURT: But is there testimony? Or is that just 14 15 you talking? 16 MR. SHEA: I believe there's testimony from -- in the 17 record on that. Or documents, source code. But that is how 18 the system works, Your Honor. And then, the other testimony -- and I should say that the 19 20 deposition designations that were played in court are lodged at 21 Docket 755-2. Just for the record, I want to put that --22 Good. Thank you for doing that. THE COURT: 23 So that's one piece of testimony, MR. SHEA: Your Honor. And I could grab others from Mr. Mackay on that, 24 25 from his deposition designations.

But I want to also -- there was another conversation I had 1 which I think gets to Your Honor's other point, which is the 2 deposition designation of Mr. Pedro. Mr. Pedro was another 3 witness who testified live. He was also a 30(b)(6) witness. 4 5 And so I had a back-and-forth with him. It's a little -um, there's a couple questions back and forth. To provide 6 context for the ultimate answer, would it be okay for me to 7 read them? Or do you want me to kind of just go to the 8 punchline, Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Go to the punchline. 10 Sure. So after some back and forth, what I 11 MR. SHEA: asked him is -- he had previously stated that there is a 12 collection of records that has information about speakers. 13 So I said (As read): 14 "Well, focusing on that collection of 15 16 records, is it fair to say that that 17 collection of records stores collectively the speaker group for later recollection?" 18 And his answer was: 19 20 "I would say yes." So Your Honor, this is now Google's other witness who they 21 brought up and who is the Goggle home designee testifying that: 22 23 Yes, after a group is created, there is a collection of records that collectively stores the speaker group for later 24 recollection. 25

So none of that testimony contradicts the underlying

back to the time of creation to look at the list of members of

a zone group, to say: Hey, this is the list of speakers that we

operation in the Google products. Google products never go

21

22

23

24

25

grouping.

should be using for invocation. We don't do that. 1 That's why 2 I said "currently." The last thing I'll say Your Honor, on Pedro is on 3 slide 59. 4 5 THE COURT: Look. Here, wait a minute. MR. PAK: Yeah. 6 7 THE COURT: See, here you say "no causing storage of zone scene for later" -- and you underline the word "later" --8 "invocation." 9 MR. PAK: That's right. 10 11 THE COURT: So that's what you say when we're talking about infringement. But when we talk about validity, you're 12 taking the opposite view, and saying it can be almost into 13 milliseconds, is enough. 14 MR. PAK: No, Your Honor. So what we're saying is 15 under their view --16 17 THE COURT: Under their view, okay. MR. PAK: Under their view, which is their burden to 18 meet for infringement, under their view, first of all, there is 19 no separation in time because -- and also, not only that, 20 Your Honor, the creation of the group already happened long 21 before this point in time. 22 23 So if you remember in the ACA technology, the group coordination occurs continuously. And it's happened ever since 24 25 the user corrected the group. So there's no question in the

Google products, even under their view or our view, that creation happened long before you get to the step of trying to use the actual group for invocation.

In that moment, when you're using it for invocation,
Mr. Mackay testified consistently during his deposition and
during trial that you're only using the current membership
information. Not something that was previously stored.

Number two, Your Honor, on Pedro, quickly. This is 1459.
(Document displayed)

MR. PAK: All the testimony we heard from Mr. Pedro was talking about the collections of records on the controller for user interface display.

But he specifically testified during trial, and not contested, that the membership information in the cache on the controller is never used for playback purposes. It's only to speed up the display. But it is not being used to play music as a group.

That, when it goes into that mode of trying to invoke a group, it's only listening to the broadcast messages, which at that moment in time will tell you which members are available and who is the leader.

So on that point, I would disagree with Mr. Shea that the leadership election process is continuous. This happened over time.

THE COURT: Okay. I have a question.

MR. PAK: Yes.

THE COURT: And this concerns the specification.

Let's say that a -- a simple three-zone player group -system. And you have -- the first two are in one group, and
then let's say No. 1 and 3 are in a different group. So 1 and
2 is Group A, and 1 and 3 is Group B. And those are -- those
are -- this is according to the way it would work in the
specification.

When you invoke -- let's say you've got -- Group A is playing. You know, two different speakers, in tandem and in synchrony. And then you've got the third speaker playing something else. And then you hit the button, and it says to invoke Group B.

Does -- but since Group A has already been invoked, what does Group 1 -- sorry, does -- not Group 1 -- does Speaker 1 switch and go to the second?

MR. SHEA: Yeah.

THE COURT: Now, your specification doesn't say. I looked. I couldn't find anywhere where your specification tells us what the answer is. So I know that's what -- I anticipated you would say: Oh, yes --

MR. SHEA: Well --

THE COURT: Or does it play both? It could be wired to play both. It would be confusion. Or, does it stick with the original invoke? So you've got kids playing rock and roll,

```
and you've got mom and dad listening to the news, and they got
 1
     a war going on. Each one of them's hitting the button.
 2
          How -- in my view, the specification gives us no quidance
 3
     on this. But I'm going to give you a chance to tell me where
 4
 5
     it does address this problem.
              MR. SHEA: Yeah, Your Honor. Thank you. And I'm
 6
 7
     just -- sorry, I was pulling up the spec. I believe I know
 8
     where -- sorry.
              THE COURT:
                         Where is that? Where would it be in this
 9
     thing?
10
11
              MR. SHEA: One second, Your Honor. Just give me a
     second to look, if you don't mind? Because I don't want to
12
13
    misstate something.
14
              THE COURT: Sure.
                         So if you go to Column 9, Your Honor.
15
              MR. SHEA:
16
              THE COURT: All right. Let's go there. Column 9.
              MR. SHEA: So, and you can see -- I think we can start
17
     on Line 1, actually, Your Honor.
18
19
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. SHEA: So what this is describing is what's called
20
     an evening scene. This is a little bit -- the evening scene
21
     here actually is a scene that would define two -- pre-define
22
23
     two separate groups. But I think the key thing, Your Honor, is
     if you look at -- it starts right after the listing of players.
24
25
          And you see the language where it says (As read):
```

"...where bathroom, family room and foyer 1 should be separated from any group if they 2 were part of a group before the zone scene 3 was invoked." 4 5 So I think, Your Honor, this is the piece of the specification -- at least one piece, and there could be others, 6 7 but this is the one I remember off the top of my head -- where this is the specification telling you that when the zone scene 8 is invoked, any players that were part of a group before that 9 gets separated apart from that group so that they get -- and 10 11 then they be -- that group is the one that becomes activated. THE COURT: Well, the odd thing about it is, that 12 phrase says "where bathroom, family room and foyer," they're 13 not even referenced in the list above. 14 The whole paragraph reads: 15 16 "In one embodiment as shown in Figure 3B..." So maybe we've got to look at 3B and that's where it will 17 explain that. 18 19 MR. SHEA: Yeah, um --THE COURT: Okay, so all right, so we see --20 (The Court examines document) 21 I'll have to study it because I don't see 22 THE COURT: 23 immediately what your point is. But the next paragraph -- all right, I'll go back and look at that passage. 24 MR. SHEA: 25 Yeah.

1 THE COURT: Another paragraph says: "One important" -- it's Line 16. 2 "One important of the features..." 3 MR. SHEA: Yeah, I think there's just maybe a typo 4 5 there, Your Honor. THE COURT: Uhm. Wait a minute. Let me -- well, read 6 7 it as is (As read): "One important of the features benefits 8 enough objects in the present invention is 9 that zones do not need to be separated before 10 11 a zone scene is invoked. In one embodiment a command is provided and links all zones in 12 13 one step, if invoked." MR. SHEA: Yeah, that's right, Your Honor. 14 Is that Party Mode? Is that what they are 15 THE COURT: 16 talking about? MR. SHEA: Yeah. That would be a user-created Party 17 Mode, Your Honor. If you were to -- if a user were to create a 18 zone scene that had all the zones then that would be one 19 20 example of a zone scene here. But I do think, at least, Your Honor, I've always read 21 that -- that -- that language, and I thank you for pointing it 22 23 out because I had forgotten it was there, about "do not need to be separated" in the context of the prior passage. And again, 24 25 I've always understood that language to mean when you invoke a

zone scene, one of the things that's going to happen is if 1 there's a previously-invoked group, it's going to separate that 2 for you automatically as part of invoking the zone scene. 3 And that's where my understanding comes from, Your Honor, 4 5 to answer Your Honor's question on that. THE COURT: Well, a different way to read that is that 6 you have -- if "bathroom, family room and foyer" were part of 7 one of these two groups that are listed here, then you would 8 have to go and manually separate them before you invoke the 9 zone scene. That's another way to read that. 10 11 Okay, I've got to study it some. 12 MR. SHEA: Okay. 13 THE COURT: Here's my -- my last thing. I'm going to ask each of you to -- I'm sorry? 14 15 (Off-the-Record discussion) 16 THE COURT: I'm going to ask each of you to submit a 17 proposal or comments on -- I -- I continue to be concerned about the issue of written description. And the fact that that 18 sentence was added and got by me -- no one bothered to tell me 19 at the time, last, a year ago. That sentence was newly added 20 21

that I expressly relied on. And you had told me that it was in there, and we relied on your brief. And it turns out that that very sentence which you didn't tell me had been added way after the fact. And I'm troubled by that, still troubled.

So I know I issued a ruling, but I also feel I was not --

22

23

24

25

I got a half a deck of cards. And I was not told the complete 1 2 truth. So I want each of you to submit a proposal or comments on 3 how the Court should go about addressing that problem. 4 5 including whether or not it's open to the Court to reevaluate that issue completely, as if it was on summary judgment or on 6 this trial record or Rule 50. I don't know the procedural --7 but I'm troubled by that. 8 You don't need to respond now, but I would like you to 9 respond in writing. So, and then I want each of you to comment 10 11 on each other's comment. I don't think you need more than ten pages to do this. 12 13 So, ten pages. What is today? It's Wednesday. 14 MR. SHEA: THE COURT: Wednesday, all right. So let's say due 15 16 next Monday, and then the following Wednesday -- at noon and 17 then the following Wednesday at noon, each side gives -- no, 18 Monday is a holiday, isn't it? THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yes. 19 THE COURT: You probably don't want to wreck your 20 holiday. All right, Tuesday at noon. 21 22 MR. SHEA: Thank Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And then each side respond on Wednesday at And, with five pages. No attachments, no nothing, just 24

ten pages, five pages. And, that's -- I'm not making a ruling

25

on whether we are going to get back into it.

Now, I also want to say one thing about Google here. I've said it before. I have been surprised that you didn't point these things out to me earlier. Which leads me to believe that somewhere in this vast armada, that you had a strategic reason -- that you knew about it. Maybe not you, Mr. Pak, but your team knew about it, and you withheld it from me because you felt it would hurt you on some other PTAB proceeding where you're on the exact opposite side of that issue. Probably even with Sonos. And so you didn't want to prejudice your -- your position in some other case.

It would not be fair to Sonos for you to hold back on that point, and then only when the judge brings it up that you say:

Oh, Judge, you're right, oh, look -- no. I want to -- I'd like to know when your side, anyone on your side, knew about that -- that issue, in any form or fashion. So you can include that in your ten things.

And then if the answer is: Oh, we just didn't know, how could it be that a team this big did not go back and read the prosecution history? You need to explain that to me.

MR. PAK: Will do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I have to go see a doctor.

I'm sorry; I'm going to take off. All right? And, I look

forward to seeing you again. On Friday, right?

MR. PAK: Yes, Your Honor. Would you like the slides

that we used? THE COURT: Give it to the law clerk. And the other side, you didn't have any slides, but you can give them equivalent slides. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is adjourned. (Proceedings concluded)

Ι	N	D	E	X

Wednesday, May 24, 2023 - Volume 11

PAGE VOL.

Hearing re Rule 50

1943 11

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, BELLE BALL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

BelleBall

/s/ Belle Ball

Belle Ball, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR Sunday, May 28, 2023